

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 17, 2008, claims 2, 10-12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 27, 28, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,516,310 (Paulley); and claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,351,742 (Agarwal).

Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 3-9, 25, 26, and 31, and the indication that claim 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Independent claim 11 was rejected as purportedly being anticipated by Paulley.

Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claim 11 is not disclosed by Paulley. As recited in claim 11, determining the join path comprises selecting the join path in which the function (of the join query) is applied on the join table rather than the first table or second table (note that the join query specifies a join of the first table and the second table to produce the join table) to reduce cost.

As disclosing the above subject matter of claim 11, the Office Action cited the following passages of Paulley: column 9, lines 36-40; column 11, lines 59-66; Fig. 3. The cited column 9 passage of Paulley refers to performing cost estimation to compare costs of partial access plans so that the “optimizer can quickly prune significant portions of the join strategy search space.” Paulley, 9:38-40. Although reference is made to comparing costs of partial access plans, there is absolutely no teaching here of selecting the join path in which the function is applied on a join table rather the first table or second table (as specified by the query).

The column 11 passage of Paulley cited by the Office Action refers to determining the cost of producing an intermediate result. As noted in this passage of Paulley, “[a] significant component of any plan’s cost concerns its buffer pool utilization.” Paulley, 11:65-66. Thus, according to Paulley, determining the cost of producing intermediate results relates to concerns regarding buffer pool utilization (since the intermediate result would have to be stored in the buffer pool). The intermediate result mentioned in this passage of Paulley has nothing to do with selecting a join path in which the function is applied on the join table rather than the first table or second table (as specified by the join query).

Fig. 3 of Paulley illustrates an overall process of query optimization in a relational database system, but provides no hint whatsoever of selecting a join path in which the function is

applied on the join table rather than the first table or second table (as specified by the join query). In view of the foregoing, it is clear that claim 11 is not anticipated by Paulley.

Independent claims 21 and 27 are allowable for similar reasons as claim 11.

Independent claim 32 was rejected as being purportedly anticipated by Agrawal. Applicant respectfully submits that Agrawal does not disclose each and every element of claim 32.

Note that claim 32 recites the selection of either a first join path or a second join path. In the first join path, the at least one of the selection predicate and projection of the join query is applied on a **join table** in response to determining that the at least one of the selection predicate and projection is applied on a complex attribute. In the second join path, the at least one of the selection predicate and projection of the join query is applied on the first table before the join in response to determining that the at least one of the selection predicate and projection is applied on a non-complex attribute.

As disclosing the two “wherein” clauses, the Office Action cited passages in columns 4 and 5 of Agrawal. There is absolutely no hint anywhere in Agrawal of selecting the first join path of claim 32, in which the selection predicate or projection of the join query is applied on the **join table**.

Therefore, claim 32 is also not anticipated by Agrawal.

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims.

Appln. Serial No. 10/056,880
Amendment Dated June 17, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed March 17, 2008

Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4370 (9786).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/17/2008

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dan C. Hu', is written over a horizontal line.

Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883